



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/685,716 | 10/11/2000 | Andrew R. Cleasby | CIS00-2909 | 5970 |
| 7590 | 04/11/2006 | | | |
| | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2176 | |
| DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. 09/685,716 | Applicant(s) CLEASBY ET AL. |
| | Examiner Amelia Rutledge | Art Unit 2176 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Ingrassia does teach state information including a document state and a session state associated with the browser, as cited in the Final Rejection, p. 5, l. 8-12; for example see Ingrassia col. 5, l. 40-49 and col. 6, l. 12-27 monitoring data activities on web pages associated with the browser, and monitoring sessions, i.e., monitoring document and session state. The combination of Ingrassia and Montulli teaches at least one of document cookies, application session cookies and communications session cookies as cited in the Final Rejection, p. 7, l. 3-6). Ingrassia also teaches setting a document property...to a common value, Fig. 9 and col. 12, l. 44-48, by displaying the common values of session ID and data values in each document displayed in the browser. The combination of Ingrassia, Pacifici, and Montulli teaches each and every limitation of the claims.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references (Remarks, p. 14), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to have combined the URL and document data capture process of Ingrassia and the document and browser cookie state information teaching of Montulli with the dynamic document change capture process of Pacifici to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to have combined the three so that the applet could have recorded both data changes and updates as well as dynamic document changes using the cookie state information as taught by Montulli and then to transmit the state information to other participants in a collaborative web browsing session via the collaboration server (Final Rejection, p. 4, par. 3-p. 5, l. 3).

Further, Ingrassia, Pacifici and Montulli are analogous art since all three inventions are directed to web page synchronization. In response to applicant's arguments regarding the international classifications of the references (Remarks, p. 14), MPEP 2141.01(a) cites: While Patent Office classification of references and the cross-references in the official search notes of the class definitions are some evidence of "nonanalogy" or "analogy" respectively, the court has found "the similarities and differences in structure and function of the inventions to carry far greater weight." *In re Ellis*, 476 F.2d 1370, 1372, 177 USPQ 526, 527 (CCPA 1973); *In re Clay*, 966 F.2d 656, 23 USPQ2d 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case all three inventions are analogous in structure and function, since all three inventions are directed to web page synchronization.

For these reasons, and the reasons of record, the Request for Reconsideration does not place the application in condition for allowance.

Heather Herndon
HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100